

**Meeting
Minutes –
Meeting No. 1**

date:	November 7, 2012	issue date:	November 20, 2012
Architect's project no:	1207.00	submitted by:	Mark Headley - SFA
project:	State of Montana High Performance Building Standards		
location:	Montana State Fund Building, First Floor Conference Room		
present:	RK: Russ Katherman, State A&E Division JM: Jason McGimpsey, MSU-Billings JC: Jameel Chaudhry, UM-Missoula WB: Wref Balsam, MT DMA CB: Chris Batson, MT DEQ AA: Art Anderson, Montana Tech TT: Tracey Thun, MT State Hospital KP: Kenneth Phillips, FWP DO: Doug Olson, Capitol Complex DS: Dan Stevenson, MSU-Bozeman WBZ: Walter Banzinger, MSU-Bozeman JW: Jim Whaley, State A&E Division SC: Sue Clark, MT DNRC KW: Kath Williams, Kath Williams + Associates MH: Mark Headley, StudioFORMA Architects		
distribution:	Posted on project website		

Communications:

1. RK and MH gave preliminary introductions. MH stated that the StudioFORMA team would include himself, Kath Williams and John Phillips of FICO who will assist in Commissioning discussions. MH reiterated that the StudioFORMA team will mainly be facilitators and not participate in the decision making.
2. KW gave a brief history of High Performance Building Standards that have currently been established in other states. She stated that the goal for the upcoming efforts would be to establish the process first, followed by defining the goals which will be the foundation for the final contents of the standards themselves.
3. KW stated the standards will be developed with a process to facilitate its review and evolution over the years.
4. RK stated that the current CDG consists of 22 State representatives with one more possibly joining from the Justice Department.
5. After various general discussions, the following points were agreed upon regarding communications:
 - RK will serve as the main point person for the StudioFORMA team.
 - A website should be set up to facilitate communications and review of documents. All information would be posted with no restrictions on this website although comments would be restricted initially to the CDG and StudioFORMA team. Email notifications will go out from RK to the CDG each time an item is posted with a deadline for comments. When final drafts are eventually ready for public review, these will be posted on the State website for a period of public review and comments. It was agreed that the MCA and AIA should be contacted when these are posted so they might notify their members.
 - The CDG participants are the point persons for their individual agencies and it will be their responsibility to gather input from within their respective agencies along the way and forward input to CDG via RK.
 - When final drafts are posted on the State site for public review and comment, the CDG participants will be listed as the contacts for their respective agencies. RK will be designated as the recipient for general public comments which he will bring to the CDG for review.
 - RK was assigned the task of working with the State IT department and developing the proper resources for the website, the public postings and the future CDG teleconferences or WebEx conferences.
 - A "no response" by the posted deadline from any CDG member on any document posted on the website for review and approval will equate to a tacit approval of the document from that person.

Definitions:

6. There was a general discussion on the goal of defining applicable projects. RK stated that if a project is funded through HB5 then it will fall under the general directive in SB0049. There was discussion on what language within the general directive allows "exemptions." It was agreed that the statement to consider "cost effectiveness" would allow for some exemptions. Exemptions from the HPBS will be allowed only if compliance is not "cost-effective" or there is some logical reason i.e. "uninhabited" spaces.
7. There was a general review of HPBS exemptions allowed by other states in the notebook that was distributed to the CDG attendees.
8. KW commented on the matrix contained in the notebook which had brief definitions of the standards in each state. Many states reference LEED, Green Globes or Equivalent and include public schools, which SB0049 does not.
9. KW commented on the building rating systems which are currently referenced by other states which include Green Globes, ASHRAE Standard 189, 2030 Challenge High Performance Building Standard – Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education (AASHE) with STARS program, National BIM Standard – United States and USGBC's LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design).
10. KW stated that there is a GSA report coming out soon that documents how GSA LEED Certified buildings are outperforming those GSA buildings that are not LEED Certified. It was requested that this be posted on the website when available.
11. KW commented on the main differences between LEED and Green Globes. LEED was developed in the US and is more urban and hot-weather oriented than Green Globes which was developed in Canada. Both systems are copyrighted and their templates cannot be copied and modified.
12. Some examples of other states' HPBS goals were reviewed with most being concise but Colorado's was reviewed as one that is quite detailed.
13. There was a general discussion on what the current standards are for Federal projects since sometimes projects are built on State land with Federal funds. KW stated that currently each Federal agency has their own requirements but it is anticipated that President Obama will be soon issuing an Executive Order requiring all Federal projects to be LEED Silver Certified as a minimum. Without a current minimum Federal standard, any State HPBS that exceeds the criteria of Federal grants may require State general funds. Consequently, projects with full Federal funding may be jeopardized, due to cost and/or schedule, if careful consideration is not given to the development of exemption language.

Schedule:

14. The general goal is to establish the HPBS by May 1, 2013, so that they will be in effect for any new construction funded by the 2013 Legislature. The schedule will be impacted by how simple or complex the final HPBS contents will be. RK clarified that SB49 applied to all construction from the effective date.

Content:

15. There was a general discussion on LEED and it was agreed that if LEED is referenced for the final standards, it could have additions that address Montana specific issues.
16. After various general discussions, the following points were agreed upon regarding the contents of the first draft of the goals and standards:
 - Third Party verification has value because it is the best way to prevent "greenwashing" and simply filling out forms without real verification.
 - KW suggested that the initial version of the HPBS could be issued as a pilot program.
 - Exemptions from the final standards should be carefully thought out and will use the building types as described in the IECC. MH and KW will assemble a list of all exemptions used by other states and post on the website for review and comment by the CDG. A goal for the next meeting will be to create the list of exemptions for the MT standards after reviewing these examples.
 - Goals should be concise.
 - JW stated that LEED may address some of the performance criteria in SB49, but LEED does not address all the criteria specifically established in SB49. The standards need to address all the criteria of SB49. Refer to section 1 (2) and Section 2 (3).
 - Third Party verification keeps a thorough set of documentation in one place and serves as a great resource of information.
 - It would be best to reference an already established standard rather than to create a new one.
 - A time period should be stated in the contents from 2-5 years for reviewing and updating the final standards or whenever new versions of LEED, Green Globes or Equivalent are released.

These meeting minutes are assumed to be a true and accurate record of this meeting unless written notification to the contrary is received by our office no later than five (5) days from the date of issuance above.

442 E. Mendenhall
Bozeman, Montana 59715
Tel. 406 / 585.1400
Fax 406 / 585..9800
www.studioforma.biz

- New construction and renovation projects that have a total project cost of less than \$500,000 should require only a 20% minimum reduction in the IECC requirements (if pertinent) as legislation requires.
- New construction and renovation projects that have a total project cost of between \$500,000 and \$5 million should require a 20% minimum reduction in the IECC requirements (if pertinent) as well as project team verification of a simple checklist for required HPBS items. These items will be generated from sustainable items that normally do not increase project costs. This checklist would be filed by the State project manager with other final project closeout documents. Verification of compliance with the checklist will be established as part of the HPBS.
- New construction and renovation projects that have a total project cost of \$5 million or greater should require a 20% minimum reduction in the IECC requirements as well as LEED Silver Certification or a Green Globes Two Globes Rating. DS requested information regarding the cost effectiveness of LEED Certification and suggested that the CDG revisit the \$5 million amount after reviewing this information.

Next Steps:

17. KW will post studies on the website that have been completed that show the cost effectiveness of LEED Certification as it relates to building budgets.
18. KW will post the GSA reports mentioned above that compares the performance of their LEED Certified buildings to the performance of their buildings that are not Certified.
19. JM requested that at one of the next face-to-face meetings, KW conduct a short workshop on LEED Certification for those who are not familiar with them.
20. RK will post on the website the minutes of this meeting for review and approval by the CDG.
21. With regards to the Goals and Standards, MH and KW were directed to write the first draft of these items based on the CDG comments and decisions made at this meeting. This first draft will be posted on the website for review and comment by the CDG.

Next Meeting:

The next meeting was tentatively set for early December with an exact date and time to be determined later. This meeting will either be face-to-face in Helena, teleconference or WebEx as decided by the CDG.

MEETING ADJOURNED 3:40PM

Submitted by:
Mark B. Headley, AIA, Principal

End of Minutes

E:\1207\CA\MeetMins\mm01-110712.doc

These meeting minutes are assumed to be a true and accurate record of this meeting unless written notification to the contrary is received by our office no later than five (5) days from the date of issuance above.

442 E. Mendenhall
Bozeman, Montana 59715
Tel. 406 / 585.1400
Fax 406 / 585..9800
www.studioforma.biz